

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/053,439	01/16/2002	David E. Dausch	30540/241132	3533	
826	7590 01/16/200	I	*		
ALSTON & BIRD LLP BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA 101 SOUTH TRYON STREET, SUITE 4000			EXAMINER		
			BUDD, MARK OSBORNE		
CHARLOTT	E, NC 28280-4000		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
			2834		
			DATE MAILED: 01/16/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

,			
	Application No. 10/053 4 3 9	Applicant(s)	2 1 /
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Davsen & Group Art Unit	
	M-Budd	2834	
-The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover sheet b	eneath the correspondence a	ddress—
Period for Reply	7		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	EXPIRE	MONTH(S) FROM THE MA	AILING DATE
 Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a rejectified above, such period shall, by default, Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statuenth and the period by the Office later than three months after the mailing term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 	oly within the statutory minexpire SIX (6) MONTHS fronter, cause the application	nimum of thirty (30) days will be cons om the mailing date of this communic to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C.	idered timely. cation. § 133).
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11-20-0	2		-
This action is FINAL .	**************************************		•
☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935.			closed in
Disposition of Claims			
Claim(s) /-8	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	is/are pending in the app	olication.
Of the above claim(s)		is/are withdrawn from co	onsideration.
□ Claim(s)			
\times Claim(s) $1-8$		is/are rejected.	
☐ Claim(s)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	is/are objected to.	-
☐ Claim(s)		are subject to restriction requirement	or election
Application Papers ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	is approved	· ·	
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected	ed to by the Examiner	. •.	
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.			•
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.	· ·	•	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)–(d)			•
☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority un	der 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a	ı)–(d).	
☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the:			
☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been re-	ceived.		
☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been red	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	lo	
☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents			·
in this national stage application from the International	•		
*Certified copies not received:			· .
Attachment(s)		·	
☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s	s) lı	nterview Summary, PTO-413	
☐ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892		Notice of Informal Patent Applica	ation, PTO-152
☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948		Other	·
Office Act	ion Summary		
S. Patent and Trademark Office	•		

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 11/00)

Part of Paper No.

Art Unit: 2834

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321© may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-8 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-7 of U. S. Patent No. 6, 359, 374 since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter, as

Application/Control Number: 10/053,439 Page 3

Art Unit: 2834

follows: a micro electric relay, a support structure, a first contact, a second contact and a piezo electric actuator.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant was prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application during prosecution of the application which matured into a patent. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Budd/ek

01/13/03